DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 125 CS 500 100

TITLE	New Orleans Revisited and Revised: Recommendations for the Field of Speech Communication.
INSTITUTION	Speech Communication Association, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	29 Dec 72
NOTE	41p.; Paper presented at the Action Caucus at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Assn. (58th, Chicago, December 27-30, 1972)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Changing Attitudes; Communication (Thought Transfer); *Communication Problems; Group Dynamics; *Information Theory; *Interaction Process Analysis; Intercultural Programs; *Research Methodology; Research Tools; *Speech
IDENTIFIERS	*Futurism

ABSTRACT

This collection of four papers is the result of an action caucus held in association with the Speech Communication Association's 1972 convention, focusing on developments in the speech communication field since the 1968 USOE/SAA New Orleans conference (ED 028 164). In the first paper, "New Orleans Revisited but Briefly," James E. Roever summarizes some of the subsequent developments in the field in view of what he considers the important conference recommendations; he then calls for an emphasis on "futurism." L. S. Harms in "World Communication: Intercultural and Futurist" cites accelerated changes in communications technology as a guide to what the communications specialists should be studying. Dennis S. Gouran in "Research in Speech Communication: A Study of Process or Processes?" views speech communication as a "series of processes rather than as a unitary process," and suggests that research be oriented to that view. In the final paper, "A Receiver Focus in Speech Communication Research: Trends and Recommendations," Charles U. Larson claims that communications behavior can best be studied emphasizing multiple methods of measurement in preliminary studies instead of reliance on attitude scales. (RN)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 071125

NEW ORLEANS REVISITED AND REVISED:

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FIELD OF SPEECH COMMUNICATION

Action Caucus

Speech Communication Association Convention

Chicago, Illinois

December 29, 1972

William E. Arnold - Caucus Director

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Speech Communication Association
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

CS 500 108

New Orleans Revisited, but briefly

James E. Roever
Queens College of The City University of New York

Prepared for Action Caucus to Focus on the 1968 USOE/SAA
New Orleans Conference
December 29, 1972

The charge to this action caucus was to revisit New Orleans. I attempted to reconstruct what went on there and then I reread Conceptual Frontiers in Speech-Communication. Neither the experience nor the tome seemed particularly important now, except as historical artifacts: even the hyphen has vanished from "speech-communication" and John Bowers will no longer be able to justify use of his strained grunt--ugh.

Then I attempted to reconstruct Wingspread 1970[1] and Pheasant Run and I reread The Prospect of Rhetoric, for in my mind I tend to link these experiences with New Orleans by comparison and contrast.

My conclusion was that it is not of particular interest to attempt to analyze the specific recommendations with relation to the topics of education, research, social issues and the like. Some of the recommendations had already occurred before they were adopted at New Orleans: some of them occurred later: some never occurred. And, of those that did occur, was it that they happened in their natural place in the history of such events or was their occurrence influenced by the suggestions that were made?

---

[1]There was also a "Wingspread" conference preceding the New Orleans conference. It is my impression that while the Wingspread conference preceding the rhetoric project conference at Pheasant Run indeed had an impact on the proceedings of that conference, the conference that preceded the New Orleans conference in fact had no appreciable impact.

Next, I attempted to arrive at a single point of view that I felt best summarized my feelings, objective and subjective, concerning the real significance of the two major projects. I concluded the following:

The essential impact of the New Orleans project was to legitimize "behavioral" or "experimental" or "scientific" research in speech communication. Many so-called experimentalists, or those the conference planners perceived to be such, came together with a few token "rhetoricians" and a "speech educationist" or two. Those "experimentalists" were young and at the peak of a movement within speech communication that had legitimized their specialties in the field; the application of descriptive and experimental methodology, while it had been around occasionally in the thirties and forties, really began developing seriously in the fifties. Science was legitimate in areas where it had heretofore not been a predominant mode of inquiry.[2] I think the key recommendations that set the tone of the conference and give it importance are recommendations one and two:

> RECOMMENDATION 1: Within the scope of a central focus on spoken symbolic interaction, the conference participants recommend that the importance of scientific approaches in speech-communication research be stressed.
>
> . . .
>
> RECOMMENDATION 2: The conferees encourage the use of scientific approaches to inquiry in many areas of speech-communication which have traditionally used different approaches--such as rhetorical criticism, oral interpretation and theatre.[3]

---

[2]The audiologists and pathologists had been doing experimental research for a longer period of time but I am excluding them from this analysis as, for the most part, did the planners of the New Orleans conference.

[3]Robert J. Kibler and Larry L. Barker, eds., Conceptual Frontiers in Speech-Communication (New York: Speech Association of America, 1969) pp. 20-21.

I believe that all other material in the volume Conceptual Frontiers in Speech-Communication can be viewed from those proclamations. To put it succinctly: In February of 1968 at the Fontainebleau Motor Hotel in New Orleans, Louisiana the scientific approach to the study of speech communication was sanctified.

Given that sanctification, it was only natural that those supported by the argument of tradition in speech communication, the rhetoricians, would have their conference. Many rhetoricians from speech communication, with several token participants from English and philosophy, gathered at Pheasant Run. Those "rhetoricians," many of them young as had been those at the previous conference, represented a tradition in the field and were those who had entered an ongoing specialization somewhere in the middle, not at its inception. Now that science in speech communication had been sanctified, they had best take a look at their business to see what their roles were in a field in which they were no longer necessarily the dominant ones, either in substance or by default. I think the key statement that sets the tone of the rhetoric project and gives it importance appears in the conclusion of The Prospect of Rhetoric:

> The scholars and teachers at both conferences were especially concerned with the relations of education to social forces. Both conferences addressed themselves to a question of grave import to education at all levels: Does education unwarrantably represent social and humanistic subjects as amenable to analytic reasoning and apodictic proof rather than as subjects only amenable to practical assessments on the basis of values and preferences humanly held? Reports of both conferences answer this question affirmatively. Issues in the arts, in politics, in social organization, are not apodictically resolvable and the pretense that they are is a major cause of contemporary social and educational unrest...

> It was argued, especially at the Wingspread Conference, that to encourage expectations of 'scientific' or apodictic determinations in problem areas where such determinations are by nature unattainable will foster disillusionment and distrust of the institutions encouraging so unattainable a hope. Participants in both conferences emphasized the need to treat such subject matters as topics which only allow conclusions found through choosing from among alternatives--all rationally defensible but engendering different human values from among which men must choose according to their own hierarchies of value. To approach in this way social issues, political issues, cultural problems, as well as artistic problems, would be to apply in these areas of thought the principles of rhetorical invention and of rhetorical communication in the classic sense. At its fullest, rhetorical analysis is simply investigation to discover the relative values of alternatives; and at its best, rhetorical communication is the presentation of the human worth discernible in any answer to any practical question.
>
> Were the judgments of our conferences accepted, sweeping changes would be necessary throughout the educational establishment of the nation. In the humanities and in the several fields of social inquiry especially, 'scientific' models would be relegated in application to those matters of detail in which 'fact-nonfact' judgments are possible, and a 'rhetorical model' specifying that human valuation is all that men can attain would control the analysis and presentation of most major data and issues in these branches of learning. To adopt such emphases in research, teaching, and public affairs would be revolutionary and would require ways of thinking, communicating, and evaluating scarcely noticed in Anglo-American thought since the so-called 'Age of Enlightenment.'[4]

I believe that all other material in the volume The Prospect of Rhetoric can be viewed from this proclamation. To put it succinctly: In January of 1970 at the Wingspread Center of The Johnson Foundation in Racine, Wisconsin and at Pheasant Run in St. Charles, Illinois in May of 1970, the rhetorical approach to the study of speech communication was resanctified.

---

[4]Lloyd Bitzer and Edwin Black, eds., The Prospect of Rhetoric (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971), pp. 243-244.

Given two dominant stances, the scientific and the humanistic (the arts have yet to have their say), that had been sanctified I think that perhaps one of the most significant symbols, and from my value judgment most important actions although it caused controversy at the time and some may still not accept it, was the joining together in 1970 of the Rhetoric and Public Address Interest Group and the Behavioral Science Interest Group of the Speech Communication Association to form one group, that dealing with Rhetorical and Communication Theory. For that merger, it seems to me, clearly exemplifies the position taken by Carroll Arnold in his recent article "Rhetorical and Communication Studies: Two Worlds or One?"

> To me, at least, the concept that historical-critical scholars and experimental-quantificational scholars do basically different work is an absurdity. That each is professionally equipped to answer special kinds of questions is clear, but they work from the same first premises about communicative processes. Or, if they do not work from the same first premises about communicative processes, someone is mistaken about the nature of communication--and that had better be proved so we can save those mistaken ones from their mythology.[5]

So, I think we are at the stage where both science and humanism have been properly sanctified, at least for the moment. Those whose methodologies best serve science and the study of statements of fact and those whose methodologies best serve the humanities and statements of value--I presume that each serves equally the social sciences--have symbolically come together. Let us not go over old ground in our action caucus. Let us not even bother, as the program for the morning session states, to "examine the recommendations of the USOE/SAA

---

[5]Carroll C. Arnold, "Rhetorical and Communication Studies: Two Worlds or One?," Western Speech, XXXVI (Spring, 1972), 78.

New Orleans Conference to determine their viability for today. Let us not be guided by "new recommendations to guide the field for the next 4-5 years" as our advance schedule of events indicates. Let us be guided by the next ten or the next 20 or the next 30 years for now we have acknowledged the potential blend of scientific and rhetorical approaches that should better enable us to attack those problems common to all of us. In method, or if you prefer a milder symbol, in metaphor, let us take the stance of "futurism" in our discussions. Let me explain.

Futurism, while it may be somewhat differently defined by those who claim to be futurists, has in common an attempt to develop predictions, which are data based, and prophesies, which are not data based, about the future. "The future" is usually not the next four to five years and may be tagged by some established symbols like 1984, the year 2000, or 2001. Many futurists take the position that for the first time humans with their capacity of mind and their technological knowledge and potential are at the threshold of having increased control over their own futures. As Daniel Bell stated when he opened the first working session of the Commission on the Year 2000: "The simple impulse behind the idea of this Commission was the question: Is it not now a fundamental responsibility for a society as interdependent as this one to try to engage in some form of systematic anticipation, some form of thinking about the future? It may well be that we are inadequate in our ability to make any specific predictions, but even so the very modest goal of simply accustoming ourselves to thinking about the future would be an important achievement.[6]

---

[6]Daniel Bell in "Toward the Year 2000: work in progress," Daedalus. 96 (Summer, 1967), 657.

Furthermore, the most sophisticated futurists, from my point of view, do not begin with a predetermined viewpoint about the future and then seek to support it; they seek to develop alternate futures. In his preface to the report of the Commission on the Year 2000, Stephen R. Graubard stated: 'Our object has not been so much to predict or prophesy as to suggest 'alternative futures,' among which choice is possible.'[7]

Now some of you may view with skepticism what you believe to be the 'passing fad' of futurism. Some of you may view what you believe to be idle speculation without adequate methodology to predict the future (but you should not make that judgment without carefully examining the Delphi technique, computer simulation, technologically based extrapolations, General Systems theory and the like) and some of you may say that it is nothing new to look at the future. I happen to think it is new to look at the future through the eyes of 'futurism' if only in the sense that futurism has provided us with a heuristic metaphor that sets our minds ajar to speculate, prophesy, probe, coddle, manipulate, and perhaps mold some of our futures. And I think that is the direction our discussion at the meeting, or at least the discussion of some of us at the meeting, should go, whether it relate to undergraduate education, graduate education, research, or some other topics we may come up with. I would like to spend the day with anyone else interested to see if we can't build the foundation of a program for the study of the future of speech communication and the study of the priorities for the problems those in that domain, whether scientists, rhetoricians, rhetorical scientists, or scientific rhetoricians, can and should develop. The questions of fact and the questions of value abound.

---

[7]Stephen R. Graubard in "Toward the Year 2000: work in progress, Daedalus, 96 (Summer, 1967), vi.

So where does this point of view lead us? I suppose many of you would agree, on the surface at least, that what the world does not need, particularly the world of speech communication, is another conference to follow up the two I have just discussed. But, I think to focus on the development of such a project might provide at least some of us with a meaningful way to approach the future of our field. I suggest we develop a project in which those who see themselves primarily as "rhetoricians" and those who see themselves primarily as "scientists," and hopefully some who see their roles as varying between the two, would come together to develop strategies and priorities for common problems and the study of common problems. For together, those perhaps more adept at formulating and testing hypotheses and developing the projected alternative futures and their components would meet with those more adept at examining the value bases of those alternate futures and the comparative values of those futures. They would chart the problems to be studied and they would begin to determine the methodologies that they need and that their "students" will need to go at those projects. Then, they will carefully draw up a number of specific projects--some to be done by individuals, some in groups, and some in interdisciplinary fashion, etc.--to begin to get at the problems we need to study for our survival and the survival of mankind. Perhaps we should plan for a conference to again convene at Pheasant Run and, if I may borrow the metaphor from the "Rhetorical Criticism" committee from the previous Pheasant Run conference, view our field in the critical prism that filters, defines, and analyzes as we

view our field and chart its future.[8] We might then call it the Pheasant Under Glass Conference.

We need a Prometheus Project[9] or a Profile of the Future[10] or a Limits to Growth[11] study for the field of speech communication. What better way to begin than to take that field in which most of us live and breath and formulate a plan for studying its future?

Let us not rehash New Orleans. Let us not project to the next four or five years in our classrooms and our research laboratories. Let us open our minds to speech communication in the decades ahead. At the least some of us will have lost a day if we accomplish nothing· at the most we may have opened our minds to new ideas that may lead to the development of alternate futures and an analysis of those alternate futures.[12]

In the preface to The Future of Man Pierre Teilhard De Chardin says: "The whole future of the Earth, as of religion, seems to me to depend on the awakening of our faith in the future' and in the preface to The Future of the Future John McHale says:

> The future of the past is in the future
> The future of the present is in the past
> The future of the future is in the present[13]

The future of speech communication is in the present and we had best be about our business of discovering and determining it.

---

[8]The Prospect of Rhetoric, p. 224.

[9]Gerald Feinberg, The Prometheus Project: Mankind's Search for Long-Range Goals (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1969).

[10]Arthur C. Clarke, Profiles of the Future: A daring look at tomorrow's world (New York: Harper and Row, 1963).

[11]Donella H. Meadows, Dennis L. Meadows, Jorgen Randers, and William W. Behrens III, The Limits to Growth: A Report for The Club of Rome's Project on The Predicament of Mankind (New York: Universe Books, 1972).

[12]For some suggestions about speech communication related problems of the future see: James E. Roever, "Speech-Communication Research: Relevance$_1$ and Relevance$_2$," Central States Speech Journal, XXIII (Summer, 1972), 109-177: James E. Roever, "Presidential Address: Prospect," Today's Speech, 20 (Summer, 1972), 35-38.

L. S. Harms
Communications Department
University of Hawaii

WORLD COMMUNICATION: INTERCULTURAL AND FUTURIST

1.0 Introduction

Half a decade ago, the USOE/SAA Conference group met for a week in New Orleans. The Conferees developed a set of 46 Recommendations. Today, those Recommendations have the quaint pre-technological ring of the good 'olden times."

Since the 1968 USOE/SAA/NO "Preservation Hall" Conference, a number of events of worldwide significance have accelerated the Communication revolution underway even then. For human communication, the Apollo 11 moon adventure demonstrated the existence of a new level of both telecommunication and transportation capabilities. Worldwide TV coverage of Apollo 11 hinted at the potential of a global satellite telecommunication network. The spaceship voyage to the moon suggested greater journeys yet to come and coincided with the emergence of global jumbo jet transportation networks. The communication satellite and the jumbo jet symbolized the accelerating post Preservation Hall Communication revolution.

A number of observations about the Recommendations bear noting. In the closing minutes of the 1968 conference, an international and intercultural dimension was added onto a few of the recommendations. The "year 2000" does not appear in any of the recommendations. Human communication is viewed as one-way rather than two-way. The recommended instruction prepares students to be like their professors. The systems approach is not mentioned. The recommendations appear rooted in the rural cultures of Mid-West America.

It is consistent, I suppose, that at about the same time, the Association passed up an opportunity to hold its 1970 annual convention in Hong Kong!

The term World Communication comes into use to describe an outlook required by the revolution in which we now find ourselves. Colin Cherry used the term as the title of a 1971 book; Harold Lasswell used the term as part of the title of a 1972 East-West Center lecture. The communication satellite and the big jet make a greater percentage of human communication intercultural, and require anticipation of future developments.

2.0 Intercultural

A number of fundamental shifts in human communication appear to be underway. Permit me to cite two examples.

The full title of the East West Center (EWC) is the Center for Technical and Cultural Interchange between East and West. The term interchange describes communication sharing and exchange, and cooperation. The work undertaken at EWC, then, requires cooperative communication among persons of dissimilar cultural backgrounds. But it is no longer one-way communication adequately characterized as a source transmitting a prepared message to one or more receivers, but rather as communicators building messages for some mutual purpose. The jet figures prominently in the intercultural interchange that occurs at the EWC meeting ground. Communicators fly in, communicate for a time, and fly on home.

The PEACESAT Project (Pan Pacific Educational and Communication Experiments by Satellite) provides a similar example of two-way intercultural interchange. The PEACESAT network now connects a dozen or more institutions of higher learning across the Pacific. The network does not have one central transmitter, and a number of de-centralized receivers, but rather

it has transceivers--the newer communication technology that enables every communicator to be both source-and-receiver, in other words, a two-way communicator. In the PEACESAT network, communicators stay at home and telecommunicate back and forth across the long nautical miles of the Pacific.

The EWC and PEACESAT operations document the possibilities of the newer jet based transportation communication network and the satellite based telecommunication network. In both cases, two-way communication, rather than one-way communication is the basic model. Equally, both EWC and PEACESAT are routinely engaged in intercultural communication

The shift from one-way to two-way communication promises to have far reaching consequences. Two-way communication appears to reduce competitive communication and increase cooperative communication. But cooperation appears to be something other than the opposite of competition, for cooperation makes possible both synergy and serendipity.

3.0 Futurist

Man the communicator can have a very long future. The life expectancy of "spaceship earth" is about 9 billion years; its present age is about 4.5 billion years. Man has been able to communicate through speech for a brief half million years. Handwriting is about five thousand years old; printing about 500; radio and TV less than 50; and, many revolutionary possibilities are less than 5 years old--post Preservation Hall. By the year 2000, cable will make a wide variety of two-way communication services available--some of them unprecedented. Change in human communication is accelerating.

the study of the future of human communication is an integral part of the world communication concept. Most future developments--both problems and possibilities--promise to be worldwide. Permit me to suggest a few possibilities from the current literature.

A major problem than can be anticipated is communication overload. Alvin Toeffler is one of the first to draw attention to the stress of too much communication. It is clear that the individual must have the right not to communicate if he is to protect himself from the new communication overload disease.

There are several major possibilities. Improved telecommunication facilities make it possible to trade telecommunication for transportation --to trade time at EWC for time on PEACESAT. Or more generally, to reduce freeway traffic by making it possible for more office workers to employ telecommunication devices installed in their homes to carry out the work of the day. The new slogan becomes "Don't commute, telecommunicate to work."

Another possibility lies in the area of communication skills. It is obvious today that many of the claims made for "public speaking" skill are extravagant. It is equally clear that the Association members and their colleagues in other countries are not actively engaged in anticipating what specific communication skills will be required at what particular future time for what class of communication purposes. Anticipatory instructional strategies can be developed--the flawless Apollo 11 and, more pointedly, the "re-designed in flight' unlucky Apollo 13 provide dramatic examples. We are doing very little to prepare humans for communication with super-intelligent man-made machines and for communication with ETI (Extra-Terrestrial Intelligences) even though we are sending messages into deep space, in particular, on Pioneer 10.

4.0 Right of Man to Communicate

Our world is interconnected by transporation and telecommunication networks. Yet, the individual human communicators who are members of the

diverse communities of the world do not have equal access to those networks. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights provides a starting point for considering the problem.

In that Declaration, Article 19 specifies that every communicator has "the right to seek, receive, and impart information..." Article 20 states that every communicator has the right to associate with anyone he chooses, but that he cannot be coerced into associating. Taken together, and extended, these two articles have profound implications for man the communicator. It occurs to some of us that no man can enjoy his full right to communicate if any other man is denied his right to communicate.

At the SCA Long-Range Goals Conference held at Airlie House in September of this year, the following statement was adopted as a Long-Range Goal for SCA: To advance the Right of Man to Communicate. At the October meeting, the SCA Administrative Committee approved the formation of a Communication Rights Commission. That Commission is charged with development and dissemination of a Declaration of Communication Rights for Mankind. That Declaration will attempt to specify the fundamental human needs for communication at the individual, community and world levels and in the areas of communication control, technology, and skills.

5.0 Association Focus and Name

The Airlie House Conference specified a number of goals that will substantially re-direct the work of the Association. It becomes again a question: does "oricity," or "spoken" serve to define, or delimit, or focus the work of the Association. The question appears to merit a negative answer. What then should the "central focus" be in the next 10 or 100 or 1,000 years? Perhaps, the central focus should be the "human communicator in both natural and artificial environments." Thus, as in its young years,

another quick name change is needed to signal a mid-course correction, a substantial change of direction ofr the Association. As a start, I suggest: Human Communication Association.

6.0 In One Day

At the Preservation Hall conference, most of the first day was consumed by Conferees delivering well-rehearsed, unsolicited, and unappreciated speeches. Perhaps, the Chicago "Revisionists" will be wiser than the New Orleans Preservation Hall "Frontiersmen" in their use of the available time.

I suggest that one of our first recommendations deal with a mechanism for an annual updating of the recommendations based on data from a monitoring system that scans the world in the manner of the "world weather watch" and the UN "Global Environmental Monitoring System." As a minimum such a monitoring network would provide information on needed new communication skills, the potentials of new communication technology, and the probable consequences of new controls and freedoms for human communication.

Aloha.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Colin Cherry, World Communication, Wiley Interscience, 1971.

Harold Lasswell, "The Future of World Communication, Address at the East-West Center, October, 1972.

John Bystrom, Selected Reports on the REACESAT Project, Department of Communication, University of Hawaii.

L. S. Harms, Intercultural Communication, Harper and Row, forthcoming, Spring 1974.

Alvin Toeffler, Future Shock, Random House, 1969.

L. S. Harms and Dan J. Wedemeyer, Communication in the Future: Selected Readings, in preparation.

Fred Casmir and L. S. Harms, International Studies of National Speech Education Systems, Burgess, 1970.

Conference Report, SCA Long-Range Goals Conference, Airlie House, Virginia, September 6-10, 1972.

Jean d'Arcy, "Direct Satellite Broadcasting and the Right of Man to Communicate," EBU Review, 1969.

RESEARCH IN SPEECH COMMUNICATION: A STUDY OF PROCESS OR PROCESSES?

Dennis S. Gouran

Indiana University

Introduction

Recommendation 29 of the New Orleans Conference on Research and Instructional Development emphasized the need for more research on "the interactive, on-going, process nature of speech-communication" (Barker and Kibler, p. 35). Although many individuals have since tried to engage in this kind of research, little new light has been shed on the process nature of speech communication. In my judgment, the underlying cause of our failure to make significant advancees in process-oriented research is that there have been so few efforts to describe the classes of relevant variables and the possible interrelationships among them. In addition, when such efforts have been made, the focus has been on communication as a general process rather than on its specific subprocesses. If we begin to view speech communication as a series of processes rather than as a unitary process, then I believe that we can begin to make substantially more rapid gains in our understanding of the entire enterprise.

The purpose of this paper is to present a rough sketch of the potentially relevant variables in one process of communication. In so doing, I am hopeful that others will make similar attempts in areas of particular interest to them and which have to do with speech communication in general. I have chosen small group decision-making as

the vehicle for illustrating the type of descriptive work on specific problem areas which I believe is so essential for the eventual illumination of the nature of speech communication as a whole. The basis for my choice is simple. Decision-making is the subject with which I am most familiar and on which I have done most of my professional writing.

The Concept of Process

In using the term process, I shall mean a system of entities having specifiable properties related to one another in such a manner that a change in any one of the properties of any of the entities in the system is functionally related to changes in any other or all of its remaining properties or those of the other entities. Any scientist whose objective is to describe a process is probably not concerned with all of the variables which he might be able to identify. More likely than not, he is only interested in studying variables which he, for some reason, suspects make a difference in the way the process functions. The preceding definition presupposes this principle.

Decision-Making as a Process

The variables which have received the most attention in studies of small group decision-making fall into three general categories, including group outcomes, communication behaviors, and contextual phenomena. Although there are many ways of looking at the interrelationships among these classes of variables, most students of group decision-making are concerned with the separate and interactive effects of communication behavior and context on particular group outcomes. As a result, the rest of the material presented in the paper is organized along these lines.

Group Outcomes

Three outcomes of decision-making discussions in which researchers appear to have had substantial and continuing interest include (1) consensus, (2) the effectiveness or quality of decisions, and (3) members' satisfaction with their decisions. The relative importance of each of these outcomes is debatable, but that each has attracted considerable attention is not. Since I have discussed elsewhere the rationale for focusing on these particular group outcomes (see Gouran, 1973), I shall devote the remainder of the present paper to the other two classes of variables and their potential relationships to concensus, effectiveness, and satisfaction.

Communication Behaviors

The behavioral content of any decision-making discussion can probably be analyzed in terms of its task-oriented, emotional, structural, social, metadiscussional, and non-verbal components. The relationship of each of these factors to the previously mentioned outcomes is not fully understood, yet some insights can be gleaned from past research. Following is some of the evidence which different investigators have marshalled in examining the role of the six variable categories listed above.

Task-Oriented Behavior:

Deutsch (1949) conducted a major investigation of the relative effectiveness of cooperative and competitive groups in performing problem-solving activities. In general, the cooperative groups were superior. Contributing to this overall finding were several specific differences in the types of task-oriented behavior manifested by the groups compared.

The cooperative groups' communication behavior revealed significantly more of the following characteristics: (1) coordination of effort, (2) diversity in the frequency of individual contributions, (3) good ideas, (4) evaluation of communication, and (5) favorable evaluation of group products. These behaviors were also associated with such group outcomes as productivity per unit of time, the quality of group products, and the members' level of satisfaction.

In a more recent study, Gouran (1969) found the communication behavior of groups which reach consensus to differ from those which do not in several ways. In respect to task-oriented behavior, consensus group members made statements which were more informative , less opinionated, and more objective than those of their conunterparts. These differences did not obtain in all comparisons; however, when the behavior of thetwo types of groups was distinguishable, the differences favored the consensus groups.

Emotional Behavior:

Guetzkow and Gyr (1954) discovered several emotional factors related to consensus in a descriptive study of organizational groups participating in decision-making conferences. One of the major findings was that when individuals express personal, self-oriented needs, decision-making effectiveness is adversely affected, especially if these needs remain unsatisfied. In addition, if discussants maintain a generally pleasant and friendly atmosphere, movement toward consensus is facilitated. Deutsch's (1949) data also support this conclusion.

Deutsch and Krausss' (1962) classic study of interpersonal bargaining have also yielded some information concerning the role of emotional behavior in decision-making. Threat potential apparently increases one's

level of emotional involvement in a manner which interfers with the successful resolution of problems. Given a task calling for a cooperative effort, the more emotionally involved the participants became, the less efficient they were.

Structural Variables:

The manner in which a discussion unfolds has some definite implications for a group's success. Bales and Strodtbeck (1951), for example, identified three clearly discernible stages of analysis in successful problem-solving groups, including evalutaion, orientation and control. In the first stage, group members tend to coordinate the information relevant to their decision. In the second stage, evaluative behavior predominates as the discussants try to reconcile their differences over judgments of fact and the appropriateness of proposed courses of action. In the third and final stage, attention is focused on giving and asking for direction in arriving at a group position.

Using a different category system from Bales and Strodtbeck's, Fisher (1970) discovered a four-phase pattern of interation in decision-making groups Classifying interaction units as favorable, unfavorable, or ambiguous toward decision proposals, Fisher (p. 56) reported the following results:

> In the early stages of the discussion, both favorable and ambiguous attitudes were expressed with greater frequency than unfavorable attitudss. Then as the proportion of ambiguous units declined, unfavorable units increased to surpass the proportional frequency of ambiguous ones. In a third phase, unfavorable units declined while the proportion of ambiguous units rose above the frequency of unfavorable ones. In the

final phase, favorable units rose sharply, and both amgiguous and unfavorable units declined sharply.

Interpersonal disagreement is a state for which many groups have relatively low tolerance. The manner in which the conflict resulting from such disagreement is resolved, however, is variable. Gouran and Baird (1972) recently found that in informal discussions, participants tend to resolve this kind of conflict by changing the subject, whereas problem-solving groups are more likely to supply additional information on the disputed point. This type of patterning is consistent with the behavior which Bales and Strodtbeck reported taking place in the evaluative stages of the discussions they studied.

As a final illustration, Guetzkow and Gyr (1954) identified a functional relationship between the structure of interaction in decision-making discussions and goal achievement. In groups in which attention is focused on one issue at a time, there is a higher probability of consensus than in groups which fail to develop an orderly attack on the problems which confront them.

Social Factors:

If any or all of the members of a group assume a competitive orientation, the outcomes of their discussions can be adversely affected. Deutsch (1949) found that in the absence of competitiveness, groups carried on more specialized activities, were more productive, and developed higher morale. Shaw (1958), Willis and Joseph (1959), and Blau (1954) all reported findings confirming those of Deutsch.

Pressure for uniformity and the conformity which results from such pressure can also affect the functioning of a group. The consequences of social pressure and conformity are not necessarily negative, however.

Berkowitz and Daniels (1963), for example, found a positive relationship between conformity and productivity under circumstances involving a norm of social responsibility. Conformity, or course, can have undesirable consequences for group decision-making when it involves the uncritical acceptance of norms which themselves are undesirable or otherwise questionable.

A third type of social element which may have implications for a group's decision-making activities is the internal power relationships among the members. Differences in power per se are not the critical factor, however. How one communicates about the uses of his power and how the members perceived it's being used determine the relationship of the variable to a group's outcomes. In a study of problem-solving by Komorita et al. (1968), low power group members were led to believe that a high power member would treat them benevolently, malevolently, or passively. The results revealed that the groups in the benevolent condition functioned more effectively.

Metadiscussional Components:

In three separate studies, Gouran (1969), Knutson (1970), and Kline (1972) found a positive relationship between a form of metadiscussion which they called orientation and consensus in decision-making discussions. The higher the level of orientation, in general, the greater a group's movement toward consensus. Knutson, moreover, discovered that the amount of orientation behavior one exhibits in a discussion is positively related to the other members' perceptions of his competence, trustworthiness, dynamism, and objectivity.

Non-Verbal Behavior:

In spite of all of the current popular and professional interest

in non-verbal communication, surprisingly little information about its role in group settings has been accumulated. Among the few studies which have been done, Rolla and Rolla (1964) found that non-verbal signals help to preserve the overall sequence of intragroup communication. In addition, O'Connor (1971) found that sheer physical activity is related to group members' perceptions of one another's relative influence in decision-making discussions. In general, the greater the amount of activity the greater the degree of perceived influence.

Contextual Variables

Any number of different contextual variables may affect the manner in which the members of a group communicate with one another and thereby indirectly the group's outcomes. Seven such contextual elements are worthy of attention, including (1) the nature of task requirements, (2) type of conflict, (3) role structure, (4) sex distribution, (5) openness of communication channels, (6) homogeneity of group members, and (7) group climate.

Nature of Task Requirements

As the complexity of a task increases, the quality of a group's performance decreases (Shaw and Blum, 1965). This rather obvious relationship results from the fact that in dealing with more difficult tasks a group has less time to work together on the various aspects of its problem. Probably not so obvious to most people, however, it is that under conditions of high task difficulty, performance is facilitated when disagreement and the uninhibited expression of satisfaction or dissatisfaction are permitted (Shaw, 1971).

Type of Conflict:

Guetzkow and Gyr (1954) have identified two types of conflict which commonly arise in decision making discussions. One of these is called 'Substantive Conflict' or 'conflict associated with intellectual opposition among participants, deriving from the content of the agenda (p. 380). The other type, 'Affective Conflict' refers to 'tension generated by emotional clashes aroused in interpersonal struggles involved in solving the group's agenda problems' (p. 380). Groups experiencing either type of conflict tend not to reach consensus; however, when they do, the kinds of communication behavior are different for each type of condition. The availability and use of facts facilitates the resolution of substantive conflict, whereas concentration on simpler agenda items is more likely to produce consensus in groups with affective conflict.

Role Structure.

Read (1962), doing research in an organization setting, found an inverse relationship between the accuracy of a subordinate's communication with his superiors and his mobility aspirations. This tendency was some what less pronounced, however, under circumstances in which subordinates have trust in their superiors. Using Read's findings as a starting point Huegli (1971) attempted to identify the behavioral factors which distinguish trustworthy from untrustworthy group leaders. In general, trustworthy leaders exhibited behavior judged to be higher in orientation, stimulation objectivity, and agreement.

Research on facets of role structure has yielded some other important findings. Slater (1955) found extreme specialization to have a negative relationship to consensus but that moderate specialization was positively related to consensus in decision making groups. In addition, Torrance (1954)

determined that the status of one's position is partially responsible for the extent of his influence on a group's decision. The higher one's status, the more likely are the other members of the group to endorse what he perceives to be the best alternative among the positions from which they can choose.

Sex Distribution:

The sex of the members composing a decision making group plays a role in determining the characteristics of the behavior exhibited. Taylor (1969), for example, detected three specific differences in the interaction patterns of males and female participants. Males were more hostile, dominating, and unreasonable. Consistent with Taylor's results are some earlier observations by Terman and Miles (1936) that American males are more likely to be rough in manner, language, and sentiments than women. To the extent that such characteristics have negative consequences for effective decision-making, the sex distribution of a group can be a matter of some concern.

Openness of Communication Channels:

The degree to which channels of communication within a group are open or restricted affects both efficiency and member satisfaction. A whole series of studies have been conducted within the last 25 years to determine more precisely the nature of the relationship between the channels of communication and group performance. Most of these investigations have been carried out in highly artificial settings involving the transmission of information among the members of a group by means of written notes. Nevertheless, the research has produced some interesting findings. When channels of communication are completely unrestricted, higher levels of morale and satisfaction devlop (see Leavitt, 1951; Shaw, 1954; and Lawson 1965.

The relationship to problem-solving efficiency is not so straightforward, however. According to Shaw (1971, p. 152) A decentralized communication network is most efficient when the group must solve complex problems, whereas a centralized network is most efficient when the group must solve simple problems.

Homogeneity of Group Members:

Although there has not been a great deal of research on the relationship of the similarity in personal attributes of group members and their performance, it appears as if heterogeneous groups may be more effective than homogeneous groups (see Hoffman, 1959 and Hoffman and Maier 1961). The basis for this difference may be the greater probability that the resources necessary for efficient performance are present in heterogeneous groups.

Group Climate:

I have previously referred to research by Deutsch (1949) and Guetzkow and Gyr (1954) showing that the establishment of a cooperative climate facilitates decision-making. Another important dimension of group climate is cohesiveness. The level of cohesiveness which develops in a group may have either positive or negative consequences for the members' productivity. Studies by Schacter et al. (1951) and Berkowitz (1954) revealed both of these effects.

Conclusion

None of the previously mentioned relationships among the three classes of variables involved in decision making enjoys the status of a scientific law. These relationships, however, do provide a core of empirical data with which it is possible to make tentative descriptions of the process.

Before we can be confident that we fully understand the process a substantial amount of further research needs to be undertaken. In trying to identify the classes of potentially relevant variables on the basis of previous research efforts, I am hopeful that others will focus on the interrelationships among them in designing future research projects. I am also hopeful that individuals with interests in other areas of speech communication will undertake efforts similar to this one and outline the classes of variables worthy of further study. So long as we continue to talk about the process of communication rather than processes of communication, I believe that the field will gain very little momentum and that a great deal of time and energy will be wasted.

REFERENCES

Bales, Robert F. and Fred L. Strodtbeck. "Phases in Group Problem Solving." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 46 (1951, 485-495).

Berkowitz, Leonard. "Group Standards, Cohesiveness and Productivity." Human Relations, 7 (1954), 509-519.

Berkowitz, Leonard and L.R. Daniels. "Responsibility and Dependency." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66 (1963), 429-436.

Blau, P.M. Co-operation and Competition in a Bureaucracy. American Journal of Sociology, 59 (1954), 530-535.

Deutsch, Morton. "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Co-operation and Competition upon Group Process." Human Relations, 2 (1949), 199-232.

Deutsch, Morton and Robert M. Krauss. "Studies of Interpersonal Bargaining." Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1 (1962), 52-76.

Fisher, B. Aubrey. "Decision Emergence: Phases in Group Decision-Making." Speech Monographs, 37 (1970), 53-66.

Gouran, Dennis S. "Variables Related to Consensus in Group Discussions on Questions of Policy." Speech Monographs, 36 (1969), 387-391.

Gouran, Dennis S. Group Communication: Perspectives and Priorities for Future Research. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 59 (1973), In press.

Gouran, Dennis S. and John E. Baird, Jr. "An Analysis of Distributional and Sequential Structure in Problem-Solving and Informal Group Discussions." Speech Monographs, 39 (1972), 16-22.

Hoffman, L. Richard. "Homogeneity of Member Personality and Its Effects on Group Problem-Solving." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 58 (1959), 27-32.

Hoffman, L Richard and N.R. Maier. Quality and Acceptance of Problem Solutions by Members of Homogeneous and Heterogeneous Groups. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62 (1961), 401-407.

Huegli, Jon M. "An Investigation of Trustworthy Group Representatives' Communication Behavior." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1971.

Kibler, Robert J. and Larry L. Barker (Eds.). Conceptual Frontiers in Speech Communication. New York; Speech Association of America, 1969.

Kline, John A. "Orientation and Group Consensus." Central States Speech Journal, 23 (1972), 44-47.

Knutson, Thomas J. "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Statements Giving Orientation on the Probability of Reaching Consensus in Group Discussions on Questions of Policy." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1970

Komorita S.S. et al. Power, the Use of Power, and Cooperative Choice in a Two Person Game. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.

Lawson, E.D. "Change in Communication Nets, Performance, and Morale." Human Relations, 18 (1965), 139-147.

Leavitt, Harold J. "Some Effects of Certain Communication Patterns on Group Performance," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 46 (1951), 38-50.

O'Connor J. Regis. "The Relationship of Kinesic and Verbal Communication to Leadership Perception." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1971.

Read, William H. "Upward Communication in Industrial Hierarchies." Human Relations, 15 (1962) 3 15.

Rolla, E.H. and J.M. Rolla. Senales Verbales y No Verbales en la Dinamic Grupal. Acta Psiquiatrica y Psicologica de America Latina 10 (1964), 315-320.

Schacter, Stanley et al. "An Experimental Study of Cohesiveness and Productivity." Human Relations, 4 (1951), 229-238.

Shaw, Marvin E. "Some Effects of Problem Complexity upon Problem Solution Efficiency in Different Communication Nets." Journal of Experimental Psychology, 48 (1954), 211 217.

Shaw, Marvin E. "Some Motivational Factors in Cooperation and Competition." Journal of Personality, 26 (1958), 155-169.

Shaw, Marvin E. Group Dynamics: The Psychology of Small Group Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Taylor, K. Phillip. An Investigation of Majority Verbal Behavior Toward Opinions of Deviant Members in Group Discussions of Policy. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1969.

Terman, L.M. and C.C. Miles. Sex and Personality: Studies in Masculinity and Femininity. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1936.

Willis, R.H. and M.L. Joseph. Bargaining Behavior. I. "Prominency" as a Predictor of the Outcomes of Games of Agreement. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 3 (1959), 102 113.

A RECEIVER FOCUS IN SPEECH COMMUNICATION RESEARCH: TRENDS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CHARLES U. LARSON, NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

There are several themes which emerge from the report of the New Orleans Conference of 1968. One is that we need to focus more of our research on communication activities (i.e., those which have communication behavior as a central focus instead of attitude formation or consistency tendencies). Another is to focus this resarch on the activities of the receiver in communication and further to identify and operationally define variables to investigate this receiver behavior. And in several places, Speech Communication researchers are encouraged to break away from the 'cookie cutter' experimental approach and to instead experiment with other methods of describing, analyzing and predicting communication behavior. Finally there is repeated commentary expressing general dissatisfaction with the heavy reliance which we have put on various forms of attitude scales for measuring what we want to investigate. This paper is an attempt to review the research trends concerning these recommendations since 1968, to look for strength or weakness in those trends and to make recommendations based on the trends.

In his "Human Information Processing: Some Research Guidlines," Gerry Miller observes that we ought to follow the advice of Becker on our reliance on attitude measurement and not fall victim to the 'law of the instrument' and assume that once having found a hammer to then believe that everything in the world needs pounding. The hammer of attitude scale measurement is a case in point in Miller's eyes, and he admonishes researchers to remember that "In terms of antecedent conditions relevant to human information processing, prior attitudes are only one of several mediating processes . . . that influence the ways in which information inputs are processed."[1]

Miller also suggests that we have often fallen into the trap of the 'experimental hangup." Donald Darnell underscores Miller's dissatisfaction with attitude change as the predominant dependent variable in Speech Communication research, but he attributes the cause of this problem to a deterministic attitude on the part of researchers and thus as a theoretical problem instead of just a fascination with the experimental format.[2] Darnell suggests that perhaps we should seek to integrate and explain human behavior instead of trying to identify, quantify and label it for the purpose of perfect prediction in future instances. Thus both Miller and Darnell reiterate the general dissatisfactions and recommendations of the USOE conference cited above.

Yet as one looks at our journals since that conference, he is likely to find titles like the ones listed below drawn from only three issues of regional and national journals.

"Ego Involvement and Attitude Change: Roward a Reconceptualization of ~~Per~~suasive Effect," Sereno and Bodaken, Speech Monographs, August, 1972

"The Effects of Message Sidedness and Evidence on Inoculation Against Counterpersuasion in Small Group Communication," by McCrosky, Young and Scott, Speech Monographs, August, 1972.

"Audience Commitment and Source Knowledge of Audience as Determinants of Attitude Change Following Counterattitudinal Advocacy," by Miller and Widgery, Speech Monographs, August, 1972.

"Evidential Attitudes and Attitude Change," by Wall, Western Speech Spring, 1972.

"Cognitive Speech as a Predictor of Post Speech Attitude and Attitude Change," by D. Infante, Speech Monographs, March, 1972.

And the list could go on and on. It is clear that we still are relying heavily on attitude scaling and that we haven't tumbled to the fact that much of our experimental research tells us about pencil and paper attitude shift but little about communication behavior. Perhaps you might argue that "we are doing other things besides measuring attitudes," or that "some of the research you cite are valuable and do add to our knowledge of the communication

process. I agree. We are doing important experimental research using pencil and paper measurement devices. And we are discovering further knowledge about attitudes and attitude change. But I would have to add a large "BUT" to those statements.

BUT

We have too frequently relied on the experimental method because we are familiar with it and on attitude scaling because it is easy, quick, and handy. David H. Smith argues that the problem lies in the difference between our theoretical notion of process as continuous, in flux, each element affecting each other element in some way and so forth and the linear cause-to-single-effect model implied by the experimental format. The two conceptions of process are antithetical in Smith's eyes.[3] It is understandable why we have relied on this static model of process for experimental purposes for so long: It is encapsulated in most statistical models and most research designs which employ experimental effects and methods. These models imply a world in which independent variables, or causes, have certain impacts on dependent variables or effects. These causes may or may not have common roots. The assumption underlying research done using the experimental method has been that as more and more researchers did more and more research on more and more aspects of more and more problems, that the nature of the problems would become clear. Part of the problem underlying this faith in the experimental method in the social sciences is that it has its roots in biometrics, a field where the assumption of a cause-effect linear model of process is more likely to hold true (i.e., development of hybrid corn varieties probably does relate to introduction of varied independent variables, repeated testing, and so forth) than it is in the Social Sciences.

Disenchantment with "the experiment" has been building in the Social Sciences of late too. Some departments of Psychology (at the University of Minnesota for example) actively encourage their students to avoid doing research using the experimental method and to instead develop their own methodologies to investigate phenomena or to use some alternate method like content or context analysis. In study focused on communication, observational techniques are being used more frequently and result in findings which are important (e.g., Bales' discovery of the use of the fantasy theme in the development of group norms and social reality). It seems that we in Speech Communication need to follow some of these directions to follow our own advice--deemphasize the experimental method; encourage the development of alternate methods of measurement to the attitude scale: explore communication variables instead of measuring psychic processes using pencil and paper testing. In short, this reassessment of progress since 1968 would conclude that communication theory at least hasn't made much--that we desperately need to move to methods other than the traditional experimental one. Rhetorical theorists and critics have been much more willing and flexible in abandoning traditional methods and in adopting innovation. They have for the most part moved away from Neo-Aristotelean methods and have adopted new and untried critical approaches. As Darnell noted in his answer to Miller in 1968, perhaps it is essential that communication theorists be exposed to rhetorical and critical points of view. He answered Miller's suggestion that behavioral scholars have better things to do than to study Classical Rhetoric and British Public Address. Darnell observed that these scholars may well ". . . learn better from some rhetoricians in many courses labeled 'Rhetoric' than they can from some numerologists in courses labeled 'Scientific Methods' "Well,some might say" then how do we go about avoiding attitude scaling, the experimental method hangup, and a focus on non-communication behavior?" I have

two suggestions: shift some of our independent variables to a dependent position by using them as measuring devices and two, utilization of multiple methods of measurement as preliminary study is being done.

Independent to Dependent

If one were to catalog the pieces of experimental research done since 1968 according to the dependent variables used for measurement and the independent variables manipulated, he would find that, for the most part, the communication variables have been in the independent position. We have studied the effects of fear appeals on attitudes, the effects of verbal commitment on attitudes, the efffect of ego-involvement on attitudes, the effect of counterattitudinal advocacy on attitudes and so on. One of the things which behavioral scholars might do to avoid the much criticized reliance upon attitude scaling is to shift some of these communication variables to a dependent position--use the communication behavior as a measuring device. For instance, instead of asking "what are the effects of commitment on attitudes?" we might ask "what are the effects of variable X,Y, or Z on the kind of verbal commitment people elicit?" Or instead of asking "what are the effects of counterattitudinal advocacy upon attitude change?" we might ask, "what are the effects of variable A, B, or C on the nature of the counterattitudinal advocacy elicited by S's?" Such a shift will necessitate the development of different measuring devices, many of which will focus on style. Initially they will be unsophisticated, but the important thing is that we will be looking at behavior which is not limited to checking positions on an attitude scale. Instead we will be looking at communication, and that is our business. Our focus will necessarily shift from the source of communication to the receiver--we will be looking at the receiver's communication behavior as it correlates with some other experience

he has had or with some other phenomemon to which he has been exposed. Some may argue that this is not a substantive change from the traditional experimental method--that we are still putting things into a "manipulated variable" and "dependent variable" mold. That can happen and may yeild worthwhile results, but it is not the only way that such questions might be asked. For example, take the reversal of the "effects of verbal commitment upon behavior" question cited above. We can ask the question outside the framework of the traditional experimental method. We might for example look at persons who have demonstrated various levels of commitment (e.g., voters for McGovern, workers for McGovern, and McGovern staff) and seek to determine what differences exist in their various communication behaviors: do they display varying degrees of non-verbal activity? do they utilize metaphor in different ways? and so on. In an initial study following this method, I have discovered that total verbal output is highly correlated with levels of commitment similar to those cited above; that verbal variety is correlated with commitment; and that relative frequency of certain words correlates with levels of commitment. The exciting thing about this kind of shift in focus is that it examines what I am supposed to be able to study and what I am trained to study--communication acts--and not on what I am not trained to study--the workings of the brain. I may ultimately draw some conclusions about the workings of the brain, and about the ways that people arrange and change biases and beliefs, but I begin with the raw material with which I am most familiar and which I am trained to explore--communication behavior. I think that this shift of emphasis of communication variables from the independent to the dependent position and the corresponding necessity to devise methods to measure communication behavior promises to be exciting and fruitful. It also leads to my second suggestion.

Multimeasurement

Assume that you as a researcher had followed the advice given above and had asked yourself a research question involving communication as an output--how and with what does it vary. Given our meager supply of methods for measuring communication output, you would be forced to look around for some way to talk about the focus of your study--some way to measure it. There would be several opitions open to you: one, you could cast about for some measuring device which would get at the communication variable which interested you, or two, you could devise your own measuring system, or three, you could try to use some content free system of measurement like context or content analysis, or finally, you could do all of these or any combination of them. I think one of our priorities in the field of Speech Communication ought to be to engage in this last option--exploring the phenomena from a variety of perspectives--trying out on -the same set of behavior a variety of measuring methodologies. We need to let measuring devices emerge from the matter being studied; we need to look at the object of study using the perspectives of other disciplines; and we need to utilize the content free methods that are available. All of these devices need to be tested in "pilot study" settings and adapted as the need arises. A good example of this kind of Speech Communication research is related to several field studies dealing with political campaigning presently underway at Northern Illinois University by M.A. students and staff members. Instead of directing students to utilize some attitude scale in a "before--after" or "after--only" design to test the effects of evidence or emotional argument or personal contact, students are instead encouraged to follow a local candidate around and to search for patterns as he campaigns. The researcher asks questions of the candidate, local party leaders, persons to whom the candidate speaks, and others. The method used here in these "pilot studies" is similar to

participant observer techniques used in anthropology except that the observer in this case does not participate in the campaign: instead he observes and searches for patterns of behavior. Once such a pattern emerges, the researcher designs a method for quantifying or evaluating the communication variables which seem to reflect or cause the pattern. Further the student checks his suspicions and his measuring device by repeating his field study a second time with full utilization of the measuring instrument which he has designed or borrowed, and thus builds a kind of test-retest reliability. Sometimes several students work on the same campaign and in this way provide not only a multimeasurement perspective before the study in consideration of various measuring instruments but in the final products of the several studies. Similar procedures are presently being used for researching small group behavior at the University of Minnesota. Several students may look at the same question (e.g., leadership emergence or the function of the fantasy theme) from differing measurement perspectives (e.g., content analysis, role diaries, etc.) or several students may look at the same set of behavior from a variety of perspectives (e.g., researching the identical groups using different devices). In some cases several students may apply the same measuring device to differing sets of behavior (e.g., the Berg Time-Devoted-to-Themes device was used in studying juries, student classroom groups and Model Neighborhoods groups).

The result of this kind of multimeasurement and of these diverse measurement perspectives in a set of patterns which are verifiable in several ways and which relate to one another as well as with a specific research focus. At both Minnesota and Northern Illinois, this research strategy has led to a number of valuable insights which focus on communication output as the dependent variable and which are not only insightful but which have implications for theory development and for subsequent research.

Though this kind of research is not as easy to conduct as the straightforward traditional experimental study utilizing some attitude scale as the dependent variable, it is, in the cases cited at least, stimulating and exciting. It is not 'push' research which one has to force himself to do, but rather is the kind of 'pull' research which draws the researcher back to itself. The value of having several persons focusing on the same question is also evident; researchers can discuss the identical topic with one another instead of topics which are only tangentially related.'

Conclusion

If the research reported in our professional journals is evidence of any trends and if the titles reported as dissertations in progress or completed is indicative of the research being conducted in the field, then we have made only limited progress since the USOE conference on the recommended directions agreed upon in 1968. There are some bright spots, but we seem still to be hung up on the experimental methodology to the disadvantage of other approaches; we seem still to have a facination for attitude scaling; and we are still not directing the focus of our research on human symbolic behavior--on communication. If we are to avoid film-flamming ourselves further and if we are to avoid generating more of what W.S. Ong, S.J. calls "peanut research' we need to follow the recommendations of the New Orleans conference. Two steps in following that advice are to shift variables from the independent position in our research to the dependent position, particularly communication output variables, and two, to utilize a multitude of measurement instruments and measurement perspectives. Though both of these steps require more work and ingenuity than the traditional experiment using an attitude scale as a dependent variable, they hold much promise for answering questions about communication instead of about psychological or sociological variables.

FOOTNOTES

1. Gerald R. Miller, "Human Information Processing: Some Research Guidlines," in Conceptual Frontiers in Speech Communication: A Report of the New Orleans Conference on Research and Instructional Development Eds. Robert J. Kibler and Larry L. Barker, (New York: Speech Association of America, 1969) p. 63.
2. Donald Darnell, "A Response to 'Human Information Processing: Some Research Guidelines' in Barker and Kibler, p. 73 and p. 74.
3. David H. Smith, "Communication Research and the Idea of Process" Speech Monographs, XXXIX, (August, 1972) pp. 174-182.